

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>10/657,612</b>	Applicant(s)	
	Examiner Frederick J. Parker	Art Unit 1762	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Frederick J. Parker. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Thad Carvis (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 12/21/05

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed: Plawman 3936541

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Mr. Carvis called arguing that his claims are directly done in 2 steps, i.e. a simple process. The Examiner noted, however, the claims are open-ended & permit additional steps, which Mr. Carvis asserted are required by prior art. The Examiner & Mr. Carvis disagreed over the interpretation of Plawman which the Examiner believes shows similar coating of grooves & surfaces, eg. Fig. 7. Mr. Carvis offered to show a video demonstrating simplicity which, given the tone of the discussion, would not appear to be useful. Mr. Carvis stated it was his job to "pull in the reins" on this patent administration to operate properly since the current administration is not doing that/making system unworkable, in reference to proposed new rule changes. In view of Mr. Carvis' tone, the Examiner respectfully terminated the phone call, indicating he would note Mr. Carvis' complaints, but the Examiner saw no route to expedite prosecution of the case.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature if required